



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/370,453	08/09/1999	DAN W. DENNEY JR.	GENITOPE-038	8128
23535 75	590 01/10/2005		EXAMINER	
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP			YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H	
SUITE 350	SIRELI		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			1642	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/370,453	DENNEY, DAN W.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Christopher H Yaen	1642				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the c ver sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	· · ———	parate, timely filed amendment				
The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a) will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☑ will be entered and an wor appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-6 and 25-32</u> .		•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·					
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
0. Other:						
		Christopher Yaen Art Unit 1642				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments submitted by the applicant regarding the 102 rejection are not deemed persuasive to overcome the rejection of record. More specifically, applicant argues that the instant invention is drawn to a multivalent compound that expresses three different variable regions. However, contrary to applicants assertions, the claims do not specifically limit the compound to having three different variable regions, instead only that the VH and VL regions differ by at least one idiotope. As argued in the Final Office action, mailed 6/2/2004, an idiotope is an antigeneic determinant found on the variable regions of an antibody, and because antibodies are essentially peptides, there are many possible idiotopes per variable region (i.e. VH or VL). Nowhere in the claims are there any specific limitations drawn to "three different variable region". Therefore the rejection of claims under 35 USC 102 is maintained.

JEFFREY SIEW SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

2